

History 410 History of Emotions: How It's Done, How
to Do It

Draft Syllabus



Goals of the course:

- (1) To explore the ways in which emotions have been studied by historians in the past and to learn new methods and approaches. All periods and areas of history will come under the purview of this course.
- (2) To present materials to the class in the form of group reports.
- (3) To write a book review OR
- (4) To write a seminar paper based on primary source research.

N.B. This class can count for a 500-level seminar for students graduating in academic year 2014-15 with the instructor's permission and on condition that the final paper is a primary-source research paper. Seminar credit should be worked out with the instructor and the GPD within the first two weeks of the semester.

Class schedule:

Week 1 Introduction

- a) the course: its nature and its requirements
- b) "AHR Conversation: The Historical Study of Emotions" *American Historical Review* 117 (2012): 1487-1531

Week 2 What are the emotions?

- Cornelius (entire)
- Maria Gendron et al, "Emotion Words Shape Emotion Percepts," *Emotion* 12, no. 2 (2012): 314-25.



Week 3 **Old Paradigms I**

Elias, *Civilizing Process*: vol. 1: *History of Manners*, pt. 2 ONLY and vol. 2: *State Formation* excerpts

due if you are writing a seminar paper: topics (title + 10 questions you want to answer)

5 or so min presentations by each student in this form:

a) *I am working on X*

b) *because I want to know Y*

c) *the likely primary sources are Z*

Week 4 Old Paradigms II

Johan Huizinga, *Waning of the Middle Ages*, ch. 1 (DC33.2 .H83 1954); or J. Huizinga, *The Autumn of the Middle Ages*, ch. 1 (DC33.2 .H83 1996)

Marc Bloch, *Feudal Society*, p. 73 *et passim* (D131 .B513)

Lucien Febvre “Sensibility and History: How to Reconstitute the Emotional Life of the Past,” in *A New Kind of History: From the Writings of Febvre*, ed Peter Burke, pp. 12-26 (DC 36.9 F32)

Week 5 Private meetings with prof to talk about group reports and papers

Week 6 **Critiques of Elias**

a) Group report #1 on

_____ Christopher Lasch, “Historical Sociology and the Myth of Maturity: Norbert Elias’s ‘Very Simple Formula,’” *Theory and Society* 14 (1985): 705-20;

_____ Robert van Krieken, “Violence, Self-Discipline, and Modernity: Beyond the ‘Civilizing Process,’” *Sociological Review* 37 (1989): 193-218;

_____ Cas Wouters, “Informalisation and the Civilising Process,” in *Human Figurations: Essays for Norbert Elias* (Amsterdam, 1977), 437-53

b) Methods: read B. H. Rosenwein in “Problems and Methods in the History of Emotions,” *Passions in Context: Journal of the History and Philosophy of the Emotions* 1/1 (2010), online at < <http://www.passionsincontext.de/>>.

Week 7 New Paradigms I: Emotions in the U.S. I

Peter N. Stearns with Carol Z. Stearns, "Emotionology: Clarifying the History of Emotions and Emotional Standards," *American Historical Review* 90 (1985): 813-36. (Per E171 .A57 and on line)

Nicole Eustace, *1812: War and the Passions of Patriotism* (excerpts)

Week 8 New Paradigms II: Emotions in the U.S. II

for students working on seminar papers: due: bibliographies of primary sources

Julie Ellison, *Cato's Tears* (excerpts)

Martha Tomhave Blauvelt, *The Work of the Heart: Young Women and Emotion, 1780-1830* (excerpts)

Week 9 New Paradigms III: The work of William Reddy

Reddy, *Navigation of Feeling* (excerpts)

_____ *Origins of Romantic Love* (excerpts)

Week 10 New Paradigms IV: The work of B. Rosenwein

Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities* (excerpts)

for those writing papers: due: bibliographies of secondary sources;

5-min presentations (no longer) by each student in this form:

a) *I am working on X in order to know Y*

c) *the secondary sources suggest Z*

d) *the primary sources suggest Z¹*

Week 11 Emotions around the World I

a) Group report #2 on articles in *Love in Africa*

b) for those writing seminar papers: due: outlines of papers

Week 12 Emotions around the World II

Jan Plamper, "Fear: Soldiers and Emotion in Early Twentieth-Century Russian Military Psychology," in *Slavic Review* 68/2 (2009): 259-83.

other readings TBA

Week 13 private meetings with professor to discuss book review



Week 14 Mini conference: presentations of papers

Seminar papers or book reviews due.

Bibliography.

(Choose a book on this list for your review, or discuss an alternative with the professor.)

Abu-Lughod, Lila. *Veiled Sentiments: Honor and Poetry in a Bedouin Society*. Berkeley, 1986.

Althoff, Gerd. *Spielregeln der Politik im Mittelalter: Kommunikation in Frieden und Fehde*. Darmstadt, 1997.

Ariès, Philippe. *Centuries of Childhood*. Translated by Robert Baldick. New York, 1962.

Boureau, Alain. "Propositions pour une histoire restreinte des mentalités." *Annales: Economies, sociétés, civilisations* 44 (1989): 1491-1509.

Cheyette, Frederic L. "Women, Poets, and Politics in Occitania." In *Aristocratic Women in Medieval France*, ed. Theodore Evergates, 138-77. Philadelphia, 1999.

Cubitt, Catherine, ed. "The History of the Emotions: A Debate." In *Early Medieval Europe* 10 (2001): 229-71.

Delumeau, Jean. *Sin and Fear: The Emergence of a Western Guilt Culture, 13th-18th Centuries*, trans. Eric Nicholson. New York, 1990.

Eustace, Nicole. *Passion is the Gale: Emotion, Power, and the Coming of the American Revolution*. Chapel Hill, 2011.

Harris, William V. *Restraining Rage: The Ideology of Anger Control in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge, 2001.

- Heyd, Michael. *Be Sober and Reasonable: The Critique of Enthusiasm in the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries*. Leiden, 1995.
- Hochschild, Arlie Russell. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkeley, 1983.
- Jaeger, C. Stephen. *Ennobling Love: In Search of a Lost Sensibility*. Philadelphia, 1999.
- Knott, Sarah, *Sensibility and the American Revolution*. Chapel Hill, 2009.
- LeDoux, Joseph. *The Emotional Brain: The Mysterious Underpinnings of Emotional Life*. New York, 1996.
- Lutz, Catherine and Geoffrey M. White. "The Anthropology of Emotions." *Annual Revue of Anthropology* 15 (1986): 405-36.
- Medick, Hans and David Warren Sabean, eds. *Interest and Emotion: Essays on the Study of Family and Kinship*. Cambridge, 1984.
- Miller, William Ian. *Humiliation And Other Essays on Honor, Social Discomfort, and Violence*. Ithaca, 1993.
- Muir, Edward. *Mad Blood Stirring: Vendetta and Factions in Friuli during the Renaissance*. Baltimore, 1993.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. *The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics*. Princeton, 1994.
- _____. *Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions*. Cambridge, 2001.
- Reddy, William M. *The Invisible Code: Honor and Sentiment in Postrevolutionary France, 1814-1848*. Berkeley, 1997.
- Schlaeger, Jürgen and Gesa Stedman. eds. *Representations of Emotions*. Tübingen, 1999.
- Scheff, Thomas J. *Microsociology: Discourse, Emotion, and Social Structure*. Chicago, 1990.
- Schmidt-Wiegand, Ruth. "Gebärdensprache im mittelalterlichen Recht." *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 16 (1982): 363-379.
- Smail, Daniel. *The Consumption of Justice: Emotions, Publicity, and Legal Culture in Marseille, 1264-1423*. Ithaca, N.Y., 2003.
- _____. *On Deep History and the Brain*. Berkeley, 2008.

Stearns, Peter N. *American cool: constructing a twentieth-century emotional style*. New York, 1994.

_____. *Battleground of desire: the struggle for self-control in modern America*. New York, 1999.

_____. *Jealousy: the evolution of an emotion in American history*. New York, 1989.

Trexler, Richard C. ed. *Gender Rhetorics: Postures of Dominance and Submission in History*. Binghamton, 1994.

Van Krieken, Robert. *Norbert Elias*. London, 1998.

Wyatt Brown, Bertram. *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South*. New York, 1982.

How to read books and articles critically (for class and reports)

1. Figure out what historical issue the author is addressing, why, and in what manner his or her “take” is different from anyone else’s. Nothing gets published unless it is “original”. Figure out what your author’s contribution is.

2. Assess whether that contribution is significant and adequate.

3. “Gut” the book or article before you read it. That means looking at the TOC (Table of Contents), Preface, Introduction, and Conclusion before you do anything else.

4. As you read, figure out how the sections (e.g. chapters) relate to one another and to the overall argument.

5. Look at the evidence that the author uses. Is it primary source evidence? Of what sort? Where was it obtained. Is it adequate to the argument the author wishes to make?

6. What theories of historical change or stasis does the author bring to the argument? Are these theories explicit? Are there any implicit theories or assumptions that you can tease out from the work--even some that the author may not be aware of?

7. All authors are “biased” in that they all bring themselves and their presuppositions to their work. Do not criticize an author for being biased. We are all biased. Even scientists are biased (they chose to work on certain things because they consider them important, and they consider them important because of certain norms, assumptions, values, and beliefs that they hold dear). The only issue here must be: does the author’s bias distort the his or her view of the materials? Or does it help bring passion and meaning to the materials?

7. Bias is not the same thing as “approach.” Some historians take a social approach, others economic, others political. Decide which approach your author has taken (it’s often hinted at the

in the title). Consider the values and the problems of such an approach.

Your reports should (a) sum up the main points of the author's argument, NOT in the order in which the author made it (avoid, "and then he goes on to say...") but in a way that makes good, crisp sense to you; (b) discuss the sorts of primary sources that your author used and the limitations and virtues of such sources; (c) mention the author's approach and his or her key underlying assumptions.

If you are leading a class discussion, the above points (a-c) should be what you aim to solicit from your classmates. But don't ask them a question without having an answer--or at least a preliminary answer--yourself!

Statement on plagiarism

I adopt the definition of plagiarism in Booth et al.:

You plagiarize when, intentionally or not, you use someone else's words or ideas but fail to credit that person. You plagiarize even when you do credit the author but use his [or her] exact words without so indicating with quotation marks or block indentation. You also plagiarize when you use words so close to those in your source, that if your work were placed next to the source, it would be obvious that you could not have written what you did without the source at your elbow.¹

¹Wayne Booth, Gregory G. Colomb, and Joseph M. Williams, The Craft of Research (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), p.167